



Campbell 248.

From the Author
January. 1. 70 -

OXFORD UNIVERSITY REFORM.

BY

THE HON. EDWARD LYULPH STANLEY,

LATE FELLOW OF BALLIOL COLLEGE.

SIMPKÍN, MARSHALL, & CO., STATIONERS' HALL COURT, LONDON
A. IRELAND & CO., PALL MALL, MANCHESTER.

1869.

[PRICE SIXPENCE.]

Sunday

2nd 1870 —

Didry Lodge,
Kensington.

Opinion

In a university ~~where~~ ^{where} truth ~~will~~ ^{will} have to be taught
fearlessly in science in
literature in history in
philosophy, and the
Theologians of the churches
will no longer ~~be~~ —

P. II. Oxford University
reform by the Hon. Lyulph Stanley

Pilate scatters unto us
What is truth? ?

March. 18 38

professorships, headships, and fellowships, not about granting the

It is clear that one of
the first steps in academic
reform is the absolute
removal of the bishops
from their offices
visitors and the
substitution of trained
and competent judicial
persons
what are they?

2. Troubles in intelligent will
as the cause of in
all words forced have
led

traveller was able to go
By this ^{aidant} path he set
out to steer in the
infinite darkness which
covers the unexplored
ocean of truth on which
he has now ventured
so far out of his depth;
by this right he goes to
neath land at last.

Front & Fine Vol II 564.

While all are at sea each
captain must manage
his own boat and keep
his course as best he can.

P. 55.

professorships, headships, and fellowships, not about granting the

It has been truly said
that science is but the
removal of the unknown
to a greater distance.
and that to a clear eye
the smakent faint is a
window through which
the infinite may be
seen. - P. F. 558

The stronger human light is
good for little at see -

and the officers of the church
if Bishofs, are not trained &
competent judicial persons
who are ² If we
and admit ~~as~~ ^{second} scientific in
abolsit Theology, when are
we to follow in pursuit of
truth through infivity.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY REFORM.

THE House of Lords having postponed the question of University Reform to the next session, the time is now opportune for Reformers both to consider what is the present condition of affairs, and also what they are prepared to demand ; so that they may be ready for energetic action next spring.

And first let us consider what we should have really gained had the bill of last session been passed intact. It represented the furthest parliamentary advance hitherto made, and was treated by many in the course of the discussion as a satisfactory settlement of the whole question. But a closer inspection of this bill will show how very inadequate it was, and how unwise it would be of Reformers to acquiesce another time in so incomplete and feeble a measure.

The idea which was embodied in the bill was in the main twofold. Absolute removal of parliamentary restrictions upon religious equality in the university ; liberty left to the university and to the colleges to determine for themselves how far they would be sectarian, how far really national institutions. But how illusory this liberty of action really is at present will be shown hereafter. The one point in which the bill went beyond this was in throwing open the Master of Arts degree to Nonconformists ; the necessity for subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles resting not on a parliamentary but on a university statute. This concession, however, is so obviously necessary that the principle has been conceded in argument by the opponents of reform ; the real struggle is about the higher dignities and emoluments of the university, such as its professorships, headships, and fellowships, not about granting the

right of voting in convocation to some possible dozen of Dissenters whose infinitesimal admixture with some thousands of Churchmen would do neither good nor harm. Even as to the endowments of the university we have cleared away a good deal of obstruction, and may notice several important concessions on the other side. Thus Mr. Beresford Hope admitted in the House of Commons that he would allow the professorships to be thrown open; and Dr. Pusey has tried to buy off some of the Dissenters by proposing either a denominational division of the spoils or the substitution of the Nicene Creed for existing theological tests. As to the offices in the university concerned with teaching, Sir Roundell Palmer's proposed declaration, somewhat resembling the old declaration of Dissenting members of corporations, that they would not use their office to the injury of the Church of England, fell so flat that we need not fear the substitution of new tests for old ones. It is clear that the hopes of the obstructive party are now, at best, to delay the complete opening of the universities for a few years, and to save a certain portion of the offices and endowments for themselves, while the rest is abandoned to the nation at large. The object, therefore, we now have to assert is not so much the admission of Nonconformists to a participation in the higher advantages of Oxford as the principle of unsectarian undenominational culture in the national universities. We have to insist upon the proposition that the universities exist for the higher learning of the nation; not as seminaries for the clergy of any denomination, not as finishing schools where half educated youths are to get through three critical years artificially sheltered from free discussion and from the conflict of opinions.

Now the bill of last session would have done hardly anything effective for the emancipation of the university from the dominion of an exclusive theological and political party. It left the university statutes and the college statutes and ordinances untouched. Tutors would still as now be required to be members of the Church of England; there would still be power in the Vice-Chancellor's Court to proceed against members of the university for heresy. The statutes, as to the teaching of the professors, would remain unchanged; their spirit may be inferred from the following instances. *Stat. Tit. 4, § 2, cap. 2*—“Should any professor know or

suspect that his scholars or hearers have any unsound and corrupt notions about the faith, he shall admonish them and earnestly recall them from their wanderings to the truth. But if anyone shall obstinately persist in any error, the lecturer is bound to report the fact to the Vice-Chancellor;" and the next chapter, entitled "of moulding and attempering philosophical learning to Divine truth," is as follows:—"In like manner it is enacted that the lecturers in philosophy shall as often as they happen to treat of questions regarding God, the eternity of the world, the immortality of the soul, and others of the same kind, always follow the opinion of those persons who on such points dissent the least from Christian truth. But if the opinions of the philosophers are in any other respects altogether contrary to godliness, the lecturers shall earnestly remind their scholars or hearers of the feebleness of human sense to comprehend those things the truth of which we know for certain by Divine revelation, &c."

Such and numberless other enactments of the same character, the inheritance of the university from successive generations of Lauds and Sheldons, of non-jurors and Jacobites, are what last year's bill would have left us hampered by. And in order to remove them we should have had to use as our instrument the Convocation of the University, a chiefly clerical body bred under the influence of the system we wish to abolish, and ready to come up by train to Oxford at the beck of an ecclesiastical agitator to vote against what one of them was heard on a memorable occasion to call "that damned intellect." The history of recent academic legislation shows what the spirit of the mass of the non-resident graduates is. Men who having many years ago satisfied the examiners in that minimum of knowledge which secures a degree, have since then lived upon their intellectual capital or hoarded it in a napkin. These gentlemen we have seen again and again brought up (in one case many of them, it was said, by a special train from Somersetshire) to vote in perfect ignorance against some statute on the details of education recommended by the great mass of those practically acquainted with the teaching of the university.

The University of Oxford stands deservedly high in the estimation of the country; the distinguished qualities of a few

among its members must reflect credit upon their Alma Mater. Its wealth, its beauty, its historic traditions, all these prevent our first national university from sinking into the obscurity in which it would be in danger of lying if the numerical majority of its members were able to have their own way unobstructed ; but it must be remembered that this majority is intensely opposed to the spirit of the time and to the wishes of the nation at large in all that concerns education and public affairs. The cries of noisy undergraduates in the theatre at Commemoration, and their political predilections, only anticipate by a few years the votes which such of them as are fortunate enough to escape plucking will give as Masters of Arts.

No doubt a great impulse was given to Oxford life by the university reform of fifteen years ago. The throwing open of the fellowships, even partially, has revolutionised, or is revolutionising the spirit of the governing bodies of the colleges, but the operation of this change is very slow, and the open fellowships themselves are being condemned in their present extravagant development as a wasteful expenditure of money needed for education. The question of the fellowships we will return to hereafter, enough to say that there are changes needed in Oxford, which cannot be effected by our present means. And first as to the power of effecting amendments in college statutes. Though the question is not free from doubt, yet on the whole it seems to be now admitted that no change can be made in the statutes or ¹ordinances of any college without the consent of two-thirds of the college and of the visitor. (I except the three colleges of Exeter, Corpus, and Lincoln.) Now the visitor is in nearly every case a bishop, and all the fellows are members of the Church of England ; the head of every college but one in Oxford is, and must be, a clergyman of the Church of England ; and I find by the *University Calendar* of 1869 that there are one hundred and seventy-four fellows in orders to one hundred and seventy-eight lay ; and this does not represent the full force of the clerical element, as in many cases the necessarily clerical fellows have a few years grace before taking

¹ The ordinances of the college are that part of the statutes framed by the Commissioners under the University Reform Act, and are of higher authority than the statutes.

orders, and therefore many of the junior fellows, who are printed as lay, are embryo clergymen who in a year or two will assume the position they are already pledged to.

And in these colleges so constituted one-third of the voting power or the visitor can stop any reform. Nor is it an idle supposition that the visitor will act not as an impartial judge of academic interests, but as the avowed advocate of his church. The late Archbishop of Canterbury, as visitor of Merton College, did not hesitate to avow in vetoing an amendment submitted to him by the college, that he considered himself bound to protect the interests of the church. The law as to visitors of colleges is so arbitrary, and they are vested with such extraordinary and discretionary power, that it is more important in their case than in that of any other judge to have men of trained, impartial, and judicial minds. Should a common-law judge or a vice-chancellor give a wrong decision there is an appeal. From a visitor there is no appeal. Other judges give the reasons for their judgments: in the case of a visitor "*Stat pro ratione voluntas.*" Other judges follow a fixed law, ascertained by a long course of judicial decisions. A visitor decides according to the "Lesbian rule" of his episcopal conscience. In short, the visitor's jurisdiction swarms with every fault from which a judicial tribunal should be free. It is clear that one of the first steps in academic reform is the absolute removal of the bishops from their offices of visitors, and the substitution of trained and competent judicial persons. But in a question like this of throwing open the universities, it is not enough merely to remove some of the obstacles to an honest administration of these institutions, if we leave the laws themselves by which the university and colleges are governed defective.

If an unsectarian and open university is right, it would be a miserable shirking of responsibility in Parliament to throw on the colleges the onus of opening themselves. Such a course would lead to a protracted agitation in each college, to renewed motions year after year in favour of opening, to irritating discussions in the common rooms on the religious question, to the division of the fellows into two hostile camps. It would have a very bad effect upon the elections to fellowships, as tempting each party to seek among the first qualifications of the candidate for his opinions on

this crucial question of open or close fellowships. Already it has been too much suspected that political and theological views have been weighed in the elections to fellowships. In some cases it is known that theological partisanship has determined the election; but the more fundamental questions of principle are entrusted to the college, instead of being determined by the proper body, that is Parliament, the greater will be the risk of partisanship destroying all honesty of election. Even with every wish to be honest, it is hard for an elector in a small society like a college not to have a strong bias to the man who agrees with himself. It is a wonder, and creditable to the fellows of colleges, that the elections have hitherto been as fair as they have been. Parliament, then, ought next session not only to remove episcopal visitors, but also to repeal all clauses in college ordinances and statutes which make membership of the Church of England a condition of holding any college office or emolument. The same should be done for the university statutes.

I now come to two objections of detail, the one as to the colleges. What will you do with the college livings and the college chapel service? The other as to the university. What is to become of the theological professors and the theological examinations? First, as to the college livings: When Oxford was a purely Church of England institution, and the fellows of colleges were nearly all clergymen, college livings fitted very well with the rest of the scheme. On the whole, I suppose that these livings were at least as well filled up as those in the gift of bishops, the crown, or private patronage. No doubt now they stand on a very different footing. For my part I should be glad that, as when the municipal corporations were thrown open to Dissenters, their ecclesiastical patronage was sold, so now, all the college advowsons should be sold and the money applied to educational purposes. But I do not see any harm in the livings being left as they are, at any rate as far as regards the interests of the parishioners. I believe that perfectly open colleges, where all the fellows were laymen and possibly none members of the Church of England, would present fairly and make as good an appointment as possible. But no doubt a popular cry might be got up by an extreme church party as to such appointments, and to get rid of the whole trouble,

I would cut the Gordian knot by selling the livings. Besides, in the interest of the college itself, it is better that there should be no bribes like college livings to entice men into a particular profession. Retiring pensions for teachers should be avowedly created, and Oxford is rich enough to found plenty of them.

The total value of the livings in the gift of the colleges and of the university cannot be much less than £200,000 a year, according to the "Clergy List." This generally understates the value and takes no account of glebes, fees, &c. These livings, if sold gradually and judiciously, would probably realise a million sterling; this sum invested in ground rents would bring in more than forty thousand pounds a year, which would be ample to provide liberal retiring pensions for all the worn-out teachers of the university, and would still leave a good surplus for other academic objects.

As to the college chapel service, I suppose that so long as the mass of the persons frequenting Oxford are members of the Church of England, that is so long as the upper and middle classes of this country are Church of England, the chapel services will continue. When the generality of Oxford men belong to some other religion, then common sense suggests that the service should cease. Already at least two colleges in Oxford have made attendance at chapel optional, and have ceased to degrade what should be a spontaneous act of the mind into an auxiliary to discipline and a substitute for a roll-call. As to the theological professorships and the theological examinations. The value of the first might be made over to the Church of England, and they might be maintained either in Oxford or elsewhere, as should seem most fit to those interested; but if they are to be maintained in Oxford they certainly should not be allowed to confer the status and rights of university professors, unless the statutes affecting the different chairs give securities for honest and independent teaching. Nothing like a Roman Catholic seminary, with its foregone conclusions and prohibition of independent inquiry, should be sanctioned by the approval of the university. As to the theological examinations, the question is now one of considerable gravity since the late theological statute has been passed.

That theology should be studied is natural, and if it is studied, the university may not improperly test proficiency in that branch

of learning, and no doubt both in the sacred languages, in Ecclesiastical History, and in the History of Dogma there is an ample field for study; but it is most improper that examination which should merely be a test of knowledge should be perverted as it has been for the first time in the history of the university into a means of propagating opinions. The university is now admittedly national. Undergraduates of all religions may come and take the degree of B.A., and yet a school has been founded which is to confer that degree in which all the examiners are to be clergymen of a particular church, appointed in a peculiar manner so as to ensure the predominance of certain views not even co-extensive with the liberty of opinion recognised by law within that church; and in this school it was avowed in congregation (I have been told) by Dr. Pusey, the prime mover of the scheme, that the holder of Unitarian views was to be unable to take honours. The Jew, the Unitarian, the Theist, all have a right to come to Oxford and study, and yet the university has founded a school from which these, on account of their opinions, are to be excluded. Are we, then, to found also schools of Roman Catholic theology, or of Jewish theology, in order to put other sects on an equality; or are we to go back to the old system, in the teeth of the Act of Parliament of 1854, and reintroduce the ascendancy of the Church of England? The present theological school, as at present constituted, is entirely contrary to the true functions of the University of Oxford, and in my opinion should be abolished. So much for the merely theological and ecclesiastical part of university reform, which alone was looked to in Sir John Coleridge's bill, which is of course very necessary, but is merely preliminary to the constructive part of the work before us. But before we leave this part of the subject we may just refer to a strong argument in favour of a free and unsectarian university from a quarter where a couple of years ago we should not have dreamed of such a thing. The authorities of Trinity College, Dublin, took the world by surprise last session by announcing through their representative that they now accepted the principle of Professor Fawcett's bill—that of perfect openness for their professorships and fellowships. Of course the Irish Church legislation of this year helped to open their eyes; but we must also give them credit for liberality and good sense. Indeed,

people now see clearly that the time for religious ascendancy having gone by, what we claim for one church we must concede to another ; and if we choose to have a purely Church of England university, we must have a Roman Catholic one, a Wesleyan one, and as many more as the different sects choose to demand. If the faith of the member of the Church of England is such a hothouse plant that it cannot live unless sheltered from every breath of opposition, why should we expect a more robust belief in the Catholic or the Dissenter ? But the country has well made up its mind that it is not going to set up and sanction with the prestige of a university a number of sectarian institutions doling severally out as much truth as they think consistent with their own opinions, and inventing as many sophistical reconciliations of science as are necessary according to their own more or less ignorant stand point. In a university, henceforward, truth will have to be taught fearlessly in science, in literature, in history, in philosophy, and the theologians of the churches will no longer be able to mete out what can be made to harmonise with their own formulas. What degradation can be inflicted on scientific men by subjection in their teaching to a theological authority may be seen in the preface to the third volume of Newton's Principia, edition of P.P. T. Le Seur and F. Jacquier (A.D. 1742) as follows :—“ P. P. Le Seur et Jacquier. Declaratio. Newtonus in hoc tertio Libro telluris motæ hypothesim assumit. Autoris propositiones aliter explicari non poterant, nisi eadem quoque facta hypothesi. Hinc alienam coacti sumus gerere personam. Ceterum latis a summis Pontificibus contra telluris motum Decretis nos obsequi profitemur.” Let no one think that similar hypocrisy would be impossible at the present day. The Church of England, restrained as it is by its connection with the state, is unable to commit the excesses to which it is being continually urged by its rash members. But the spirit which is always condemning science in the interests of theology is still alive. It is not ten years since the Bishop of Oxford, now visitor of five colleges (New, Magdalen, Corpus, Trinity, St. John's), attacked Mr. Darwin's hypothesis of natural selection on theological grounds, and every one can supply instances of a similar spirit from his own experience. Dr. Pusey, the head of the

*What is
truth.*

reaction in Oxford, has more than once endeavoured to persuade the hebdomadal council to discourage the study of Mill's Logic, on the ground that it is prejudicial to the faith of the young men. We must not, therefore, suppose that the story of Galileo and the Pope is now to be relegated to the common places of rhetoric, and that no similar danger threatens us at the present day. On the contrary, ecclesiastical exclusives are continually waging a war without truce against free inquiry. Like Dido they proclaim—

Nullus amor populis nec fædera sunt,

and they invite the co-operation of Dissenters against free study only in the hope of being able afterwards to turn round upon the Dissenters. In fact, the pretensions of the Sacerdotal party in the Church of England who are the most active opponents of an open university are those of the Mediæval Church of Gregory and of Innocent, the Ritualists

Cum pulchris tunicis sumunt nova consilia et spes.

But the contrast between youthful vigour and aged decrepitude is too marked, and we smile when we see the modern imitators of Hildebrand don again

Their youthful hose well saved a world too wide
For their shrunk shanks.

But, assuming these ecclesiastical and denominational hinderances to a free university to be cleared away, we now come to the more important part of the work—the reconstruction of the university as a place of education first, and secondly as a home for the higher learning in the various departments of human knowledge.

And first as to education. I find by the *Oxford Calendar* that in 1868 five hundred and seventy-nine undergraduates matriculated, and three hundred and fifty-two took the degree of Bachelor of Arts. That is, in their career through the university, about one-third of the freshmen drop out; of the remaining two-thirds, one hundred and sixty-eight, or less than one-half, took some honours. So that of those who came to Oxford, less than a third take their degree in such a way as to indicate any amount of study, one-third achieve a simple pass, and more than a third disappear. When we consider

the enormous revenues and appliances of Oxford, its nineteen colleges, with their stately buildings and luxurious establishments, we may well be surprised at the small result. What the revenues of Oxford are exactly it would be difficult to say, but they can hardly be put at less than £200,000 a year, besides what is received from the undergraduates themselves; and besides this there is the value of the buildings, libraries, gardens, and other fixed property, which, though not producing income directly, must be considered as adding greatly to the attractiveness and dignity of the university.

Probably the revenues of Oxford and Cambridge exceed the revenues of all the continental universities together; and yet when we look at the result, we see this paltry number of less than one hundred and seventy-seven a year turned out with any pretence to education.

It is clear that there must be a great waste here, and great misuse of our wealth. And, first of all, one large item of expenditure strikes every one, which has been already referred to, that is the fellowships. There are in Oxford, under the ordinances in force, three hundred and seventy-six fellowships; of these thirty-six are at present suspended, but, if things go on unchanged, it is contemplated that all these shall soon be in existence. These fellowships are almost all of them tenable for life, if the holder remains unmarried, and does not acquire a certain amount of property. Subject to these conditions, and, for about half of the fellowships, to the obligation to become a clergyman, a young man may now at Oxford, at the age of twenty-two, obtain a sinecure of from two to three hundred pounds a year for life. The amount of university money spent in this way is certainly more than £80,000 a year, and probably quite £90,000. The argument in favour of the fellowships is that they are a great stimulus to study; that they enable poor men to start in professional life, and get through those years of poverty which always hamper men till they have made their way; and that they secure intelligent and active-minded men for the governing body of the colleges.

No doubt, to a certain extent, all these arguments are true; but they are not sufficient to justify the institution as it exists at

present. Of course, if we compare fellowships as they now are with what they formerly were, tied up in every way by restrictions of birthplace, family, profession, orders, they are a very salutary advance. If we compare them with what might be done with the money, we shall have to condemn them as wasteful and ill-applied. It is true that fellowships are a great stimulus to study. But they are a stimulus to a particular kind of study, that which colleges are in the habit of rewarding by fellowships ; and thus many men have been diverted, by the attractions of a fellowship, from learning that which their natural bent would draw them to if left free. This, of course, would be remedied by apportioning the fellowships more fairly among the different studies of the place; and this should be done with those which are preserved, for I do not contemplate their extinction, but only their curtailment ; and a smaller number than at present would suffice for the encouragement of study. Secondly, fellowships enable poor men to enter on professional life. This, too, to a moderate degree, is not bad ; it is only the exaggerated sums spent on this that I complain of. But it is no wonder that fellowships have been tolerated so long, for the vast revenues of the university have been so squandered that prize pensions were less mischievous than the old modes of getting rid of our money, when pensions were equally enjoyed as sinecures, but without being obtained by merit. It must be remembered that the fellowships have been somewhat reduced in number from what they were under the old system, they have been limited, though clumsily, to a maximum value, and professorships and scholarships have been founded out of them. It is what has been already done that enables us now to proclaim, with some chance of being heard, that more should be done in the same direction. Lastly, as to the fellowships giving the colleges intelligent governing bodies. This has been true so far as the fellowships have been open, and, as I would not sever the connection between the fellows and the colleges, and would make the fellowships still more open, this good would exist in a greater degree than before.

What I would do then for the fellowships is this. Instead of £90,000 a year I would not spend more than about £30,000 a year. The fellows, instead of dividing uncertain sums, and being

the beneficial owners of the college estates, subject to certain outgoings, should receive definite payments, which I think would be high enough at £200 a year. Instead of a pension for life the fellowship should be terminable in ten years, by which time a man ought to have established himself in whatever branch of life he has chosen. All other restrictions should be abolished, and so there would be at least fifteen fellowships to fill up every year, or one hundred and fifty altogether. These fellowships should be given fairly among the different studies pursued in the university, and after an examination conducted by competent examiners as the Craven Scholarship is now given. Already, to a great extent, this principle has been recognised by several colleges which make a practice when a fellow is elected for proficiency in some subject outside the routine of the classical school of appointing special examiners and electing on their report. Elections conducted on this plan would tend to counteract the danger which the ordinary fellowships examinations are not quite free from, that of encouraging fluent cleverness rather than solid study in any one department. These fellowships being certain in their recurrence and perfectly free from restrictions, clerical or other, would probably enable quite as many young men to enter on the professions of the law, medicine, literature, or art, as the more numerous but irregularly recurring and restricted fellowships which now exist.

It may be thought that one hundred and fifty fellowships dispersed through the university would give small governing bodies to the different colleges, and so they would, but the governing bodies of the colleges might be supplemented by the professors, readers, and lecturers, who would need to be created in large numbers, and who, though having university functions, might be attached to the different colleges, and they would bring up the numbers of the governing bodies to a sufficient strength. And here I may mention that it is not at all contemplated to destroy the colleges as separate bodies within the university; on the contrary, these several partially independent corporations may be very valuable both as creating smaller and more intimate societies within the large body, so that young men coming up to the university are not so lost as they would be without this natural opportunity of making acquaintances and friendships, and also as

furnishing an opportunity of initiating changes and improvements which, if successful in one college, can be speedily imitated in another. All that is wanted is a greater freedom in the working of the college system, especially as to lectures and a revision of the scholarships, so as to prevent the present pernicious system of one college bidding against another for undergraduates, and as a result the bribing of men to go to a bad college where much promising material is spoilt by the incompetence of the teachers.

A great deal in the way of improving the college system is being done already by the voluntary efforts of the colleges. It is a good many years since the first blow was struck at the old college system, by which a tutor was supposed to be responsible for the whole instruction of his pupil. There is probably hardly a college in Oxford where the system of college lectures and division of labour amongst the tutors and lecturers has not superseded the old exclusive relation of tutor and pupil. Several colleges have established a community of lectures, which enables the division of labour to be carried still further, gives the student a wider range of instruction, and gives the teacher classes of a more reasonable size. In the higher mathematical teaching of the university, in particular, the co-operation of lecturers has been carried out very efficiently. In this matter, therefore, probably we may hope that the good sense of the teaching body will be able to continue the work quietly, and that no important reform is needed. But in the matter of scholarships a reform is needed which must come from without, for the *esprit de corps* is too strong, even in the best colleges, to allow us to hope that what we want will be done voluntarily from within.

The object of scholarships and exhibitions is not to increase the prestige of any particular college, by bringing to it clever men who take high degrees and win university prizes, but to enable deserving men to come up to the university and pursue the higher education, which otherwise they could not do. We need not now argue the question why restrictions as to poverty are undesirable. That is admitted by those who have studied this question. But leaving the scholarships perfectly open to unrestricted competition, it is clear that they ought not to be so held as to make it likely that poor men will not get the full benefit of them. Now, un-

doubtedly, the scale of college living being arranged to suit an average, it must be higher than the poorer men would choose for themselves, and unattached students will be able to live more cheaply than members of a college, certainly more cheaply than members of several colleges which might be named, frequented by rich men, and where luxurious habits are allowed among the undergraduates. Besides, students should be free to select the teaching which they think will suit them, whether that of university professors, supplemented by private teaching, or that of the different colleges; therefore the scholarships should all be thrown into a common stock and given by general examinations, and those who gain them should be free to hold them, either as unattached students or to join what college they please. In that case the colleges, being no longer able to bribe men to come to them, will be forced to rely on their intrinsic merits to attract students. Besides, there will never be a fair chance for a revival of the university outside the colleges, unless unattached students are allowed to hold scholarships. Otherwise any able man who comes up unattached will be absorbed in the colleges by the attractions of an exhibition, and only the refuse will remain unattached, so that inevitably the class will be looked down upon, whereas if they were able to hold scholarships, able men would continue unattached, and as such take high honours, and this hopeful experiment for popularising the university would have a better chance of success. I have already noticed the crying evil of attracting clever boys into bad colleges, and there so spoiling them by inefficient teaching that they leave the university less educated than they came. I do not expect or wish that these changes should overturn the college system; but they would ensure the existence of a healthy body of university students by the side of the colleges, and would stimulate the colleges themselves.

No doubt it will be urged by some that new scholarships for the unattached should be founded side by side with the college scholarships, and the latter left undisturbed. This I do not desire. First, there is quite enough money at present spent in scholarships, only it is not economically applied. Secondly, this would leave in full operation the great evil of the existing system—the bribing men to bad colleges. The Rector of Lincoln, in his work

on Academical Organisation, puts the amount of money spent in Oxford on scholarships at £35,000 a year. Now, if we gave scholarships of £60 a year for five years, we should out of this money have close upon one hundred and twenty scholarships a year to give away, which, probably, is more than enough to provide one for every boy of promise who wishes to come to Oxford.

These scholarships might be given away through the Local Examinations, which, though very inadequate at present, contain the germ, which is capable of development, of a natural union between the university and all the schools in the country. It is unfortunate that they have been called the Middle Class Examinations, as that seems to give them a sort of second-rate character which has prevented some of the schools of higher reputation from sending in their pupils for examination. No doubt the examination itself has not been all that could be desired, still it is a great thing that the scheme should in any form ever have been piloted through all the shoals of convocation. Let us hope that the university may go on with and improve its Local Examinations, and make them the necessary door of entrance to the under-graduate life. It is a disgraceful thing that any college in its discretion should be able to admit any person, however ignorant, to be a member of the university. A matriculation examination has been required of the unattached. It is clear that a similar examination must soon be required of all. The A.A. degree might very naturally be used for this purpose, and a separate examination, somewhat harder, held in Oxford for those who, being too old for the Local Examinations, desired to come up to the university. A certain number of scholarships, the greater part being given at the Local Examinations, might be reserved for older men, or for exceptional cases. If they were given to the patronage of the Delegates for the Local Examinations, or for the unattached students, or to some other responsible persons, they might be applied to exceptional cases without great fear of jobbery.

But in this case I would have a statute defining the obligations of those to whom the patronage was entrusted, requiring them to be satisfied that the person whom they chose was one who by his ability was likely to profit by university teaching, and there should

be an annual report to the council of the grounds on which these scholarships had in each case been given away. It might well be that men of a humbler class, mechanics or others, who had shown originality or genius, might thus be brought up to the university. But any appointment by patronage must be jealously watched ; and for far the greater number of scholarships the principle of unrestricted competition must be firmly upheld.

But it is not enough for the university to take precautions as to what kind of persons shall be allowed to come into residence. A stricter discipline than hitherto must be enforced upon the undergraduate while he is in residence. This matter has hitherto been left to the college, and the better colleges have been fairly rigorous in requiring industry as a condition of residence. But some colleges have been a scandal to the university by allowing hopelessly idle men to stop up term after term who never even went through the farce of pretending that they had any intention of passing through the schools. We have had notorious cases of rowdyism tolerated time after time, apparently in consideration of the high position of the transgressor, and that, too, at one of the most important colleges in the university. It would probably be a good thing if it was made a general rule, as is now the case in some colleges, that any undergraduate who failed a second time to pass any examination in its proper course, either by rejection of the examiners or by omitting to go in, should, unless he could show good cause for his default, be prohibited from residing. There are few things worse for a place of study than the presence of those drones who, doing nothing, are always promoting some frivolous or possibly mischievous amusements to the detriment of those who might work.

We must not expect in Oxford at the present day anything like the fabulous numbers of the middle ages, but there seems no reason why we should not look to a considerable increase in our numbers, if we can satisfy the middle classes of this country that we are able to give a thorough and sound education, without creating habits of extravagance and superciliousness which unfit young men for prosaic business. We ought to be prepared to take in at least a thousand beyond the fifteen hundred who probably now represent the maximum of our undergraduates. But if we wish

really to attract students from the less wealthy classes, it is not too trivial a detail in a scheme of reform to suggest that the university should do something for their comfortable accommodation. A large and simple lodging-house, with from eighty to a hundred rooms plainly furnished, and let at a rent of not more than £8 to £10 a year, would be a most desirable enterprise for the university to start, and if that were found successful more of a similar character might be built. Again, a good and simple eating-house, such as those we have heard so much of at Glasgow, might be set on foot if we wish to show that we are in earnest in providing facilities for the new class of students. These institutions, which should be self-supporting when once started, would be a far greater relief to poor men than a few scholarships in a place where nothing had been done to reduce the scale of living below what rich men were accustomed to, and would cost far less.

It has before been observed that the pass degree does not represent any real work or intellectual exertion, and the natural inference would be to abolish it, and not bestow the university's certificate on the false pretence of knowledge. But perhaps this is too strong a measure to hope to carry. What I would, however, propose is this, that the B.A. degree should be conferred upon all pass men and fourth-class men, and that all who take honours in the first three classes; in any final school should thereby acquire the M.A. degree; we shall thus escape the reproach of selling our M.A. degree for money, instead of letting it represent any advance in learning on the B.A., and we shall ensure that those who vote in the government of the university shall not be destitute of real education. Of course the university would lose a considerable income in fees by this change, but if our degrees are to be popularised, we should not raise our income by taxation which presses heavily on the poor; and the university and colleges are superfluously rich to make up any deficiency. Of course the higher degrees also should no longer be the subject of traffic. They should be bestowed only by vote of congregation on such persons as may be recommended by the council for their eminence in the different branches of learning. If we are to make the university popular we must not only make it accessible to poor men, but we must also do something to reduce the time of study.

At present four years and a-half of residence are usual for those who take honours. It seems to me that it would be a very moderate reform to reduce the maximum time to four years, so that one who comes into residence in the October term should take his degree in the Summer term of the fourth year. I should prefer a still further reduction, so that a man coming into residence in October, 1869, should take his degree in the October term, 1872; but at any rate the former reduction ought to be made. Moreover, moderations should be passed a year after coming into residence, and I think that, to diminish expense, any person who can take honours in moderations should be allowed to do so immediately on coming up to Oxford, and to count a year towards his degree, so that he would, if reading for honours, take his degree with less than three years' residence at the most.

But all these changes will not bring very many more persons to the university, unless we are ready to teach them what they value. Oxford has the reputation of being concerned solely with the dead languages and ancient philosophy, with things remote from practical life, and with neglecting new ideas and new science. We have seen this charge more or less prominent in speeches of Mr. Froude, of Mr. Lowe, and of Lord Russell, and, strangely enough, far more prominently in Mr. Froude and Mr. Lowe, who ought to know about Oxford, than in Lord Russell, who needs know very little about us. We feel that this charge is not deserved, or at any rate that it is grossly exaggerated, and whatever may be our shortcomings we are not prepared to accept Mr. Lowe's Civil Engineer as the noblest product of the century—the best result of modern education—not that we disparage the mechanical skill which has covered the world with steamers and railways, but that we adhere to the theory that our function is to train the character of the man and of the citizen, and to fill his mind with the truest conceptions of knowledge, rather than to teach those practical applications of science which after all the workshop will teach better than we can. But though we have done more than we have got credit for, we have not done enough.

We have too much insisted on a classical foundation to our superstructure; a certain concession was made when the non-classical schools were set free after moderations. I think we might

go a step further, and still requiring some classics for our matriculation examination, we might after that set men free, if they were reading for honours in any school. The schools of the middle class are deserting the classics to a very great extent. If we wish to ensure that what they teach they shall teach well, we must give up some of our pride and isolation, and be willing to teach more perfectly and thoroughly those things of which they sketch the outline. If we adhere too much to classics, while they branch off to modern and scientific subjects, we shall at last be like a grand old river bed or aqueduct from which all the feeding streams have been cut off. I do not wish to disparage the classics. I am inclined to think that language is probably the most perfect instrument for training the mind of the young; but it is a necessity which is on us to concede something, and we cannot fight against the world. We may, however, preserve a good deal of the classics in the schools if we are not too obstinate.

Another thing which should be done—though I fear the suggestion will be unpopular in Oxford—is this: A considerable part of the endowments which are now concentrated locally in Oxford might, with advantage, migrate to different parts of England. There are many large manufacturing towns utterly without any institution for the higher education. We want colleges up and down England, in connection with Oxford, analogous to the colleges in the different towns of France, all under the University of France. In this way only might we really do justice to the wills of founders, and at the same time do what is most wanted at the present day.

When mediæval benefactors founded colleges or fellowships in Oxford, in connection with their localities, their intention was to improve the education of their own country; and Oxford being the seat of learning was only chosen as the means, but was not the object of their benevolence. At the present day Northumberland would be far more benefited educationally by a thoroughly good college in Newcastle, than by the possession of eight or ten fellowships at Queen's. Lancashire would profit more by an extra £3,000 a year to Owens College than by the maintenance of the Hulme trusts at Brasenose, and so of other places. I do not dwell at all on founders' intentions, for I think what we have to

look to is what is needed now for education, not what founders four or five hundred years ago may have thought. But for those who may consider my proposal a spoliation of Oxford, my argument may have weight. I no more mind spoliating Oxford than spoliating the founders, but I do mind spoliating education by applying money less efficiently where it might be applied more efficiently. I think if some twenty thousand pounds a year were taken from the superabundance of Oxford and applied to the establishment of colleges in the principal towns of England in connection with Oxford, high education would be brought within the reach of many who now are unable to get it. The success of Owens College is a great testimony to this, and if a selfish argument has any weight I would say that the influence and popularity of our universities would be greatly increased by such a colonization of offshoots.

So much for the University of Oxford as a place of education, but we have also to speak of it as a seat of the higher learning. Hitherto what has been done in this direction has been done as it were accidentally, and not from any definite purpose in the university to promote study. A few considerable names stand out of late years, but not enough for the credit of Oxford. We had Wilson in the chair of Sanscrit ; and Gaisford, when Professor of Greek, worked hard in his own department of scholarship, but a nominal payment of £40 a-year as professor cannot be considered as a stimulus to exertion, and if the Dean of Christ Church chose to study it was a work of supererogation in him. Till the reform of the university we had hardly any professors, and college tutors found their time occupied in preparing pupils for the schools ; but now we have a few professorships, and some of them not inadequately paid. We can therefore begin to be familiarised with the idea of learned men maintained in decent comfort, and enabled to study far beyond the educational requirements of undergraduates. Not that learned professors should be relieved from the task of lecturing, but it should be recognised that teaching through books is as much a part of the professor's duty as oral teaching, and that one who gives the world a work of real thought or erudition has earned his salary amply though he should lecture to blank walls. But attractive as is the idea of learned men codifying, so to speak,

the most recent results of inquiry in their subjects, and giving us new discoveries of their own, there is one great difficulty in giving substance to the idea, and that is ensuring an honest selection of the most distinguished and eminent man in his own department. We have had many modes of appointment, and we cannot say that any one is perfectly satisfactory. Hitherto no doubt we have been hampered by theological restrictions and by local jealousies. In some cases the best man was legally disqualified ; in others the electors had too imperfect a notion of their duty to choose the best man. Of all modes of appointment election by convocation is probably the worst. No voter feels responsible in such a multitude. The body is not competent to judge of qualification, if it wished to choose fairly ; and we know that the determining causes of its actions are quite foreign to the real merits of the matter it has to deal with. Congregation has been suggested as a proper body. I doubt its suitability even if reformed. It seems to me that it would probably have many of the faults of convocation, which are faults common to every large body, and which make them unfit to exercise patronage. Nomination by a single person has one great advantage—undivided responsibility, and if the single person is well chosen this method would probably give good appointments. But that person must not be a grandee, a prime minister, a chancellor of the university, or any such person—to him the nomination is a small matter. An improper appointment does not fill him with shame or subject him to the censure of those among whom he lives, and whose approbation he values. We have seen in Oxford the most ludicrous appointments made by prime ministers to reward political partisans or to conciliate a theological party, without any consideration of academical interests.

A single person understanding the subject, and residing in the university, would make fair appointments, but there would be some objections to him. First, he would be apt to take not the best man, but the best man Oxford could furnish ; there would be a tendency to treat the resident sub-professors, readers, or lecturers, as having a vested interest in the reversion to a better chair. Secondly, divided as Oxford is at present into parties, there would be a danger that any resident would appoint not the best man, but the best man of his own party. This last objection I do not

think likely in the long run to be as important as the first. Then we may give the appointment to one person interested in the subject, but not connected with the university. In many cases this would probably work very well. Thus the Astronomer-Royal would probably make very good appointments to mathematical or astronomical professorships. His own scientific reputation would be at stake, to a certain extent. A man who has reached such a position has a scientific point of honour and love of his subject which makes him inclined to appoint the best man, and he would not like to offend the university by putting in a clearly inferior man. But there are some chairs as to which it might be hard to find any one man fit to be trusted with the appointment, and in any case of a foreign elector there would be a good deal of jealousy in the university, and the usual common-places, "Are we not fit to choose our own professors?" Small boards of persons interested in the subject make fair electors; such a board should not perhaps be of more than five members, and they should vote openly.

There is a danger, however, in boards, that the local member is apt to have the appointment by talking over the other electors, and making representations as to the wishes of the university, and so forth, which the other electors do not like to withstand. On the whole, one elector or a small board of persons all interested in the subject, and not more than two of whom should be Oxford men, seems to me the best mode of election. In any case we must deem ourselves fortunate if among the imperfections of humanity we get the best man every other election. At that rate it would be well worth while to have some twenty professors, at about £1,000 a year each, for the principal subjects of study of the university. There must of course be other professors or lecturers in the university in some subordination to these, at least with lower salaries, but probably associated with the higher professors for the conduct of examinations, and for framing suggestions as to the modification of studies from time to time. If there were forty of these, at £500 a year each, and if some £10,000 a year were at the disposal of the professoriate for assistants, demonstrators, and temporary lecturers, perhaps the university would be well supplied. The colleges would have some lecturers beyond these for the ordi-

nary preparation of the undergraduates; but the professors being connected with the different colleges would no doubt bring their personal influence to bear on the students in their own colleges, very much as the tutors are supposed to do now, and the mass of the teaching of the university would gradually fall into their hands. The lower professors, as being more engaged in the routine teaching than the higher ones, might well be appointed in Oxford, and probably the governing bodies of the colleges would make good appointments. It may be objected that if nearly all the teaching were done by university officials the college tie would be too much weakened. But this has not proved the case with those who study physical science, who get all their instruction at present at the museum from professors, and not from college tutors.

Lastly, something remains to be said about the economic arrangements of the university. It has been suggested that some £60,000 a year should be saved in fellowships. The existing professorships, apart from theology, have endowments of about £15,000 a year; to these some £30,000 or more should be added; £20,000 a year it has been proposed to spend in the creation of local colleges in connection with the university; probably some £5,000 a year would be needed to make up the loss of fees on degrees, and we should still have £5,000 a year to spend on the libraries, museums, and galleries of the university, even if other expenses remained fixed and the revenues did not improve. But a considerable economy might be effected in many other departments of the colleges. Thus in one college a sum of £6,000 is annually spent in augmenting the college livings, and no doubt lesser sums, but mounting up considerably in the aggregate, in other colleges. Several of the smaller colleges might with advantage be amalgamated, whereby many college officers and servants who are needlessly doubled might be saved. The headships, as at present constituted, are over-paid, and have hardly any duties. No doubt £10,000 a year might be saved in the whole university on their incomes. The present administration of college estates is wasteful. Learned corporations are not fit to be landlords; and if the estates were gradually sold and the price invested in good ground-rents, the income of the university would be largely increased and the cost of management very much

diminished ; this reform alone would probably add £50,000 a year to the revenues of Oxford. The purchase of ground-rents of 99 years' leases would be a sufficient insurance against the depreciation of gold which some expect. All these economies would leave an ample margin, after allowing for the most liberal retiring pensions to teachers, for subscriptions to scientific objects, for sending out travelling fellows to conduct either antiquarian, or historical, or scientific investigations abroad, or for such extension of the professoriate or of affiliated colleges as might be deemed necessary. A needful economic reform which ought to be immediately enforced upon the colleges which are really trustees of their property, is the annual publication of their accounts in an intelligible form and audited by an independent accountant. Such is an outline of some of the measures which appear desirable for the greater efficiency of the university of Oxford. Any discussion in detail of the studies of the place and how they should be modified is not for the public, but must be left to academical persons. I have also not discussed the constitution of the governing body of the university, though much might be said on that subject. But it seems to me that the immediate task of reformers is to demand a bill carrying out the ecclesiastical emancipation I have sketched in the earlier part of this paper. When this is won our opponents will give us much less trouble in educational details : for these we shall need a further act of parliament creating a new executive commission who in concert, if possible, with the colleges and with the university, may frame such regulations as shall enable the academical machine to work freely and without friction.

In what I have written I have not addressed myself exclusively to Oxford men, so that perhaps I shall appear to my readers sometimes over-minute and going into detail ; sometimes re-stating with needless particularity principles which are accepted as truisms by university reformers. In many things I have said, I have no doubt I am merely repeating the suggestions of others ; but a common purpose of reform and common principles create common thoughts, and we cannot sift in our mind what was our original property and what has been converted to our own use from others. I am sure that where I am an echo, and not an

original voice, I shall have the approval of those whose views I repeat in the propagation of them, though in my own name. To those who are at present disconnected from the universities, I would say—though I think they feel it without the need of being reminded—that this question of University Reform is not a trifling one, nor one that merely concerns a few literary or speculative persons. On the contrary, a free, national, unsectarian university will be the source of a more sympathetic feeling between classes; it will be the breaking down in youth, when the mind is susceptible of impressions, of sectarian animosity and class pride; it will extend cultivation and refinement to many whose sound sense and sterling qualities lose half their effectiveness on account of a certain uncouthness of expression ; and for these reasons we should press on, regardless of the timidity of those who only anticipate the shipwreck of their own formulas in the midst of opposing currents of thought, and in spite of that selfishness which would narrow the universities to be the luxury of a privileged few, instead of opening them as wide as possible to all the people.

